App I IX 4

Previous References (1942-43 Ml)

File No 72-42-
Serial Nos 56, 57, 93

Later References

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos

Part B for Jany 1944

SUBJECT

Grant of land to Jojman Bairappa in the Kumarapark area

93 To the Ml Commr. Bldg thro P&S
No L7458 of 21-1-44

States that Govt are not in favour of granting the land belonging to them & that the Ml cl may give compensation in money in the usual course

Ills
24/2

From "The ML Commr" Bgl to the Govt
No Rl-197/38 dt 12-1-43
Forwards for orders of Govt a
copy of the resolution of the ML CL
dated the 26th Oct 1942 relating to
the grant of site No 147, Subedar Chatram
Road, Bgl measuring 728 sq yds to
Mr Bandappa in exchange of the land
belonging to him in Kumbarguni Road,
acquired by the MCB, on condition of
his paying Rs 4 per sq yard of the excess land
1) ~~Through the ML~~ I have resolved
to grant site No 147 Subedar Chatram
Road measuring 728 sq yds to Mr
Bandappa in lieu of his lands in
Kumbarguni Road, acquired by the
MCB subject to the condition of his
paying Rs 4 per sq yard ~~of~~ for the
land which is in excess (728-439=78)
2) The ML Commr reports that Mr
Bandappa did not own 3 bits of land
as stated by him but he owns only
one bit marked c, in the plan enclosed
Mr Bandappa also is not able
to prove his title to the bits of land
by documentary evidence & the
Commr requests that the resolution of the MCL
need not be sanctioned
3) Submd for orders

4 Have awards been passed in respect of plots A, B & C referred to in the Kunthagunda road - as belonging to Bandappa? What is the amount of the award and has it been delivered to him? In the case of A & B - if they have been acquired, to whom has the compensation been paid? Was at the first mentioned hearing for the notice of the award at the meeting held on 26/11/42? And what action of the city rules Sect 43 has the recommendation been made ~~[illegible]~~ to veto the resolution of the Pl Bd? or enquire

[illegible] 27/1/43

6) Submit with a draft letter for approval

[illegible] 26/1

[illegible] 26/1

[illegible] 26/1/43

[illegible] 26-1-43

7) Issue

[illegible] 28/1/43

To: The Secl Commr, Bangr, thro PWD

No 7465 Dt 30-1-43

Calls for some information

Letter No L1 197/38, Dt 22-3-43 from the Secl Commr, Bangr, furnishing the information called for with the records.

TYPING 28 JAN 1943 GEN & REV

SWSA 3/2 [illegible]

8) subs It is reported that no awards have been passed in respect of plots A, B & C & that no award was paid to any one. It is also stated that the entire file relating to this case had been placed before the ml cl

9) The ml Comr was asked in this office letter no L 7465/ml 92-42-5/ to state under what section of the C.P. Mtles 1933 the recommendation was made to veto the resolution of the ml cl but this point has not been answered.

"h" 30-1-43

10) Kind reference is also invited to the note appended by the Pol while forwarding the letter of the ml Comr

4/5

11) definite information on the above point (Pay) may be obtained

8/5/43

12) Submd with a draft letter for appl.

4/5

Law Secy 4/5/43

13) Issue as 5/5/43

To the ml Comr, Bcy. thro Pol Cus 3-5-43

no L 10818 dt 7-5-43

Calls for some information

9/5

Letter No CB90/42-43 dt 1-6-43 from the Dy of P&Rev stating that a recommendation was made to Govt (as ML Commr) to Veto the resolution of the ML CL under Section 24(1)(b) of the Mysore Cy-Metres Act 1933 etc.

4) In para 5 of this letter, it is stated that the site proposed to be given to Mr Bandappa is situated in the Kumara Park area which belongs to Govt & that it is very valuable

A

15) The above letter is submitted for perusal & orders with reference to para 11 supra -

UB 10/6 JDM 11/6

16) Definite information on the above points may be called for from the ML concerned as to the site belongs to the Govt or not draft

11/6/43

17) Submit with a draft letter for appl.

UB 14/6 JDM 16/6

18) Issued 15/6/43

To the ML Commr, Bangl, this P&R No L12277 dt 17-6-43

Requested him to state whether the site belongs to the Govt or to the ML

Sus A 20/6 J.I

Letter No L1 197/38 dt 5-11-43 from the ML Commr, Bangl furnishing the information called for

No 844

Office of the Assistant Engineer,
Buildings Range
Bangalore dated, the 13th Dec'43

14897
16 12 43

To
The Government Architect
in Mysore Bangalore

Sir

Layout plan of subedar chattram road, Bangalore

With reference to your letter No 991 dated 8-12-43 requesting to furnish certain particulars regarding the above I have the honor to state that the above layout was dealt with entirely by the City Municipality and not by this office The information required may therefore, be obtained from the City Municipality as they are not available in this office

I have etc,

Assistant Engineer,
Buildings Range

LR/13-12

file submitted
20 12 43

ROM

The ~~Chief Engineer of Mysore.~~ Govt Architect &

Public Works Department

Bangalore

991/8 12 43

To

The Assistant Engineer

Buildings Range

Bangalore

Subject Layout plan of

Subedar Chattram Road

Bangalore

Sir

I have the honour to request you kindly to ~~send me~~ give me the following particulars ~~for~~ which I require urgently in connection with a ~~long reference~~ ~~inquiry received from Govt~~.

1) The full layout plan of the Extensions to the east of Subedar Chattram Road

2) The conditions and rates at which the Kumara Park land in this area may be sold for the forming of the sites

3) A copy of the Government Orders relating to the land under reference may kindly ~~be sent to this office~~ ~~enclosed at least the relevant~~ orders may kindly be quoted

~~Yours~~

Yours etc

7/12 43

A

7 12 43

8/12

of 42 Page •

3) that a portion of the site
line in the sketch,
295 sq yards belongs to
a park area & that the
portion of the site belongs

reference is also invited to
3 - note of the PWD
reference to para 16 supra
a portion of the land to
extent of 2 85 sq yards
to be granted to Mr ~~Bandappa~~
Bandappa - is in the
area - belonging to Govt
& to Govt P.W.D will be
to furnish his opinion as
it can be made available
grant in exchange for the
from the land given by the
for municipal purposes -
22) For orders

Law Secy) for
26/11/43

23) Ces
27-11-43

with compliments
Engineer of Bangalore P.W.D
for opinion in the matter

Ramachandra
27/11/43 for Secy to Govt
Law Secy

30—GPB—50 000—5-11-42

Reg the grant of land Site No 147 Subedar Chatram Road Bangalore measuring 728 Sq yds to Mr Bandappa in exchange of the land belonging to him in Kumara Park

Submitted to C E 1140 / 23 12 63

25) (1) Govt has ordered some time back, that the Kumara Park land to the West of the Railway line should not be partitioned in sites and sold as originally intended. Therefore I do not think that the Government portion of the proposed site can be made available for handing it over as compensation to Mr Y Bandappa

(2) The giving of sites at an upset price to private parties is a procedure which is always open to misapprehensions and which should be avoided unless the land in question is of no value to the Municipality or to Govt or cannot be disposed of by public auction

26) Also in the case under reference it will be fairer and simpler to pay Mr Bandappa for the land acquired from him, and not to invite justified criticism by handing him over land at a rate of Rs 4 which from public auction would fetch anything between Rs 10/- and Rs 15/-

23/12/63

RO 304 / 26 12 63

27) The Govt decision to dispose covers the whole ground connected with the question & am in entire agreement with the views expressed therein

Law Secy

23/12/63

Ch Engr

23/12/63

28) Submit for orders with reference to Paras 21-23 supra

(Ans 29/12 29) This is a case which, in the ordinary course of things, ought not to have come up for govt at all. It presents certain peculiar features. In the first place there is difference of opinion between the Municipal Comr & the Municipal Council, as the former considers that the M'L'C would be put to loss by this transaction. Secondly the question of a grant of 295 sq yds of land belonging to the Govt in the PWD is involved. If the land said to belong to Mr Bandappa had been acquired under the provisions of the L.A Act, the grant of exchange land would also have been settled by the L.A officer.

PUD I 30) According to the M'L Comm's letter dated 12 1 1943, three bits of land measuring 4473 sq yds (439 78 yds) situated in the Kumbargundi Road area stand to belong to Mr Bandappa were taken away for the purpose of the road. It is seen from the records that there is no documentary evidence to prove his title to the land & that neither he nor his ancestors were paying any, taxes

PUD I

on the land lands. The claim to one of the lots measuring 101 66 sq yds is proposed to be admitted, as it is adjacent to the applicant's house & they is valued at Rs 232/-. The M(Revenue has, in his forwarding note, stated that

PUD II

several owners of lands in the city have no documents of title in their possession but give evidence of having had the property in undisturbed possession for several generations & that such evidence cannot be easily brushed aside. It is to

measuring 28 sq yds

for the state that the cost of the land proposed to be given in exchange might be Rs 7000/- if sold in public auction but if given at an upset price of Rs 4/- per yd it would amount to Rs 2912/-.

Para 25 & 26

11) The Chief Engr has stated that the land to the extent of 295 sq yds situated in the Kumara Park area cannot be disposed of in the market proposed (vide paras 25 & 26 of the note supra). In the circs of the case, it is a for orders of the M(el may not be informed that the first portion of the land cannot be granted that in regard to the grant of the other portion of ~~the~~ the land in exchange, action

may be taken under the L.A. Act to acquire the bit of land belonging to my Board offa & to reserve the question of grant of land in exchange for the L-A Meer

33) certain information was called for in this connection from the VL Comm on 7-5-43 It is seen that the Inspector General of Police has replied to this letter on the ground that, when he (Minister Kheny was the VL Comr, the transaction in question took place. This does not appear to be the correct procedure, as he might to have sent in his opinion to the present municipal Comr for comments to Govt. This letter is for personal for orders

Langley for 8/1/44

This is not correct 10-1-44

SECT LAW DEPT 649 1 111 PUD CVT OF MY ORE

33) As to the highly priced by the G & the C the portion of the land belonging to the Govt cannot be given

34) The Municipal Council may give compensation in money for the lands acquired in the usual course

Para 25-26 of the 2 ARS Report

OFFICE OF THE MINISTER FOR L S G & P H Dt 10 1 1944 No 46624

Mr 12-1-44 Mr 12-1-44 35) 12/1/44 10 Jan 44

FILE

Draft reply at once
for
12/1/1944

Submit with a draft letter for approval
WB
19/1

Issued
19/1/44

2 1 N 0 4 93
GEN & REV SECTT

To The Ml Comm, Brisbane Qld
No L7458 Dd 21-1-44
States that Govt are not in
favour of granting 295 sq yards of land
belonging to the Govt & that the owner
may give compensation in money
for the land acquired from the Band affairs

Rbfp

BANGALORE CITY MUNICIPALITY

4214

No L1-197/38 MUNICIPAL OFFICES

Encl Gn file 9a 8 pl

Bangalore 12th January 1943

FROM

ABDUL AZIZ KHAN ESQ B A
MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONER
Bangalore City

C Narayanaswamy Naidu Esq , B A B L
SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE
LAW DEPARTMENT BANGALORE

SIR

I have the honour to state that one Mr Yajaman Bundappa filed an application stating that three bits of land belonging to him measuring 473 53 sq yards were taken up by the Municipality for the formation of Kumbargundi Road, without paying him any compensation and claiming an exchange site in the City Several endorsements were issued to him requiring him to prove his title to the land claimed by him He replied that he had no documents to prove his title

The Municipal Engineer and the Revenue Officer were asked to verify the title and the Municipal Engineer reported that no documentary evidence was forthcoming except a mahazar - stating that these bits were owned by Mr Bandappa He also reported that one bit of land marked C in the enclosed plan measuring 101 66 sq yards of land might be considered to be his as this land was adjacent to the applicant's - house

The Revenue Officer also reported that Mr Bandappa - stated that he had no documents relating to these bits of lands and that he and his ancestors were not paying any ta on these lands

Considering all these facts it was proposed to take up acquisition proceedings in respect of plot C" only

In the meanwhile the Hon President placed the file before the City Improvement Committee with his note stating that an area of 439 78 sq yards of land was taken over by the

the Municipality for the formation of Sri Jayachamarajendra Road and that a suitable site may be granted to him either in Gandhinagar or Subedar Chatram Extension The City Improvement Committee resolved on 16-7-1942 that the applicant may be given site No 147, Subedar Chatram Extension measuring 728 sq yards after he deposits the cost of excess land at the rate of Rs 4/- per sq yard

This was approved by the Municipal Council at their meeting held on 26-10-1942

Again the file was sent to the President with a note that this question may be reconsidered by the Council as the land proposed to be given to the applicant is 728 sq yards as against 101 66 sq yards of land taken from him and that the rate fixed as upset price was also too low and that this grant of exchange site would result in a loss of about Rs 6,000/ to the Municipality

The President returned the file s ating that it is opposed to Municipal Act to bring this subject to alter the decision of the Council so recently passed on 26-10-1942 Further all the points raised by the Office were fully considered by the City Improvement Committee and the Council and that no fresh case is made out by this drastic change and that the resolution might be given effect to immediately and that the Office will note that they ought not to put up notes revising the Council's decision and all facts they should place before the Council before its decision

I may add that the question of granting the exchange of land asked for was not at all referred to the Council or City Improvement Committee by the Office But the President referred the matter before the City Improvement Committee on the petition of the applicant dated 8-4-1942 who resolved as above and which resolution was approved by the Council

Since sanction to this resolution of the Council would

entail loss of Municipal funds to the extent of Rs 6,000/- and especially as he has not substantiated his claims to all the three bits of lands it does not seem reasonable in the interest of the Municipality to grant him this valuable land in exchange

Under the circumstances I request that sanction of Government may not be accorded to the above resolution of the Council

A copy of the resolution of the Council dated 26-10-1942 together with a copy of the resolution of City Improvement Committee and also Office file are herein enclosed for favour of orders of Government in the - matter

I have the honour to be,

Sir

Your most obedient servant

Forwarded with compliments

PRESIDENT

MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONER

ksm

Appendix F G —1]

SUBJECT

Section ML

File No 92-42

Serial No 57

Diary No of letter replied to

No L 7465

To Records

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *194*

Date of issue 30 / 1 43

Signed by Mr GPRao.

The ML Commr, Bldg, thro PDS

Sir,

With reference to your letter No R1-197/38 dt 12-1-43 re the grant of Sy No 147 measuring 728 sq yds in the Subedarchatram Road, B, C/f to Mr Bandappa, I am directed to request you to be so good as to furnish information on the following points —

(1) Have awards been passed in respect of adjoining plots at B&C, referred to in the Kumbarwadi Road as belonging to Mr Bandappa

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

2) What is the amount of the award and has it been paid to him?

(3) In the case of A & B, if they have been acquired, to whom has the compensation been paid?

(4) Were all the facts now mentioned brought to the notice of the council at the meeting held on 26-10-42?

(4) Under what section of the City Melbourne Act 1933 has the recommendation been made to Court to Veto the resolution of the M.C.C.?

Records accompany for expeditious return

I have etc

[illegible] Secy to Crown Law Dept

26/1

BANGALORE CITY MUNICIPALITY

No L1-197/38
Encl One file

MUNICIPAL OFFICES
Bangalore 22nd March 1943

6574

FROM P Suryanarayana Setti, Esq , B A , LL B ,
~~ABDULKAZIZKHANESQIX EX~~
MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONER
Bangalore City

To
C Narayanaswamy Naidu, Esq , B A , B L ,
SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE
LAW DEPARTMENT BANGALORE

SIR

With reference to your letter No L 7465/M1 92-42-57 dated 30-1-1943 calling for certain particulars in connection with the grant of site No 147, Subedar Chattram Road, Bangalore City to Mr Bandappa, I have the honour to state in reply to points 1, 2 and 3 raised in your letter, that no awards have been passed in respect of plots A B & C and no award was paid to anyone in view of the facts explained in paras 1 &3 of my letter No L1-197 of 38 dated 13-1-1943

As regards the fourth point, it has to be submitted that the whole office file with the connected notes up to the date 30-4-1941 were placed before the Council before they passed their resolution in the matter on 26-10-1942

As the resolution of the Council adversely affected the finances of the Municipality to the extent of about Rs 6,000/- as

Probable cost of site No 147 measuring 728 Sq Yds	Rs 7,000	noted in the margin (as per actual calculation it amounts to
Cost of plot C (101 2/3 Sq Yds) as per valuation of the Municipal Engineer	232	
Value of the excess extent of land to be recovered from the party (728 -440 = 288 Sq Yds @ Rs 4/- per Sq Yd)	1,152	
	Rs 1,384	
	Rs 5,616	

Rs 5,616/-), it was suggested that the resolution of the Municipal Council may not be sanctioned

The corrected records are herewith returned

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Forwarded with compliments

The petitioner, Mr Y Bandappa

P T O

P Suryanarayana Setti
Municipal Commissioner

mlt

The petitioner, Mr Y Bandappa has been agitating over this question of grant of land for over 10 years as seen from the records and as early as in 1940 when Mr S Narayana Rao was the Municipal Commissioner, on a petition of Mr Y Bandappa ~~and~~ ~~after~~ dated 21st March 1940 he ordered an investigation into claims of Mr Y Bandappa and after satisfying himself as to the genuineness of his claims, the Commissioner enquired in his letter dated 27-4-1940 to the Municipal Engineer, with reference to the claims of Mr Y Bandappa for three bits of land in Gangamcherry if there was an equal extent of land available in Kumbargundi area, for being given to the petitioner But the Municipal Engineer replied in his letter dated 8-6-1940 that no site was available in Kumbargundi area and that the petitioner might select a site elsewhere and accordingly Mr S Narayana Rao, the then Municipal Commissioner, by an endorsement dated 12-7-1940 informed the petitioner that as there was no site available in Kumbargundi area, he might select a site elsewhere

From that time, the petitioner has been repeatedly demanding a site and has not got any tangible relief from the Municipality Even after Mr A Aziz Khan became the Municipal Commissioner, on a petition of Mr Y Bandappa asking for grant of site No 8 in Kumbargundi Road in exchange of the properties marked A,B C in the plan, the Municipality did not question the claims of the petitioner, but the then Municipal Commissioner, Mr A A Khan, made a reference to the Executive Engineer Buildings Division if that site was available for disposal and thereafter an endorsement dated 9-12-1941 was issued to the petitioner that the question of disposal of site No 8 will be taken up for consideration only after the adjoining lands were acquired and some more sites formed in the locality

When the petitioner again approached the Municipal Council in his petition dated 8-4-1942 the matter was referred to the City Improvement Committee, which after going through the whole subject, as a measure of equity, granted identical extent of land in Subedar Chatram Road Extension and for the excess of the land it has charged at a rate of Rs 4/- per square yard which is the rate at which land was sold in the area at upset price to several others Neither at the City Improvement Committee nor at the Council was anything brought to light about the facts averred in the Municipal Commissioner's letter dated 13-1-1943 which was presumably sent at a time when there was no permanent President to forward it with a note as to the correct state of affairs

The value of land and the imaginary and alleged loss to the Municipality are not correct and are highly exaggerated Probably, the cost of the said land might be Rs 7000/- if sold in public auction but if given at an upset price of Rs 4 per sq yd as is given hitherto in the locality in several cases, it would not be more than Rs 2912/- It is also presumed that the applicant has no claim over plots A and B in the plan In several cases, owners of lands in this City have no documents of titles in their possession, but give evidence of having had the property in undisturbed possession for several generations We cannot ordinarily brush aside such evidence, particularly in the absence of evidence to show that such land ever belonged either to Municipality or any other owner

This reply does not answer the several questions raised in your letter dated 30-1-43 but an attempt is made to gloss over the issues so definitely framed

It ould not be proper for a Local Self Government Institution to adopt an unsympathetic attitude towards the petitioner who is an Harijan So, I request you to kindly place the materials before the Government and obtain their kind sanction to the Council resolution

V K Gowrishankar
Honorary President

JRB

J 10818 Dt 7/5/43

To The Mil Comr, Bang thro PA

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No R1-197/38 Dt 22-3-43 in the matter of the grant of a site No 147, Subedar Chatram Road, Bang to Mr Bandappa, I am directed to ~~state~~ point out that the information ~~called for~~ relating to item No 4, (B) requesting you to state the section of the City Mcpl Act 1933 under which a recommendation was made to veto the resolution of the Mil Cl, called for in this office letter No J 2465/Mil 92-42-57 Dt 30-1-43 has not been furnished.

I am therefore to request that ~~the~~ the same information on this point may be furnished ~~as already called for~~ very early.

I have etc

Yours

for Law Secy to Govt

6/5/43

T l Addre
POLICE
PHONE No 2108

POLICE DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE

A.C.B. 90/42-43

Dated Bangalore June 1, 1943

FROM

The Inspector General of Police in Mysore
Bangalore

To

The Secretary to Government,
Law Department, Bangalore

SIR

With reference to your letter No L 10818/M L dated 7-5-43 addressed to the Municipal Commissioner, Bangalore City, requesting to point out the Section of the City Municipalities Act, 1933, under which a recommendation was made to veto the resolution of the Municipal Council regarding the grant of site No 147, Subedar Chathram Road, to Mr Bandappa, a copy of which has been sent to me by the Municipal Commissioner requesting me to send a reply thereto, I have the honour to state that as it was found that the finances of the Municipality would be adversely affected to the extent of about Rs 6,000/- if the site referred to was granted to the party, I suggested to the Vice President who was looking after the duties of the President, that the matter may be placed before the Municipal Council for reconsideration

2) As the file was returned by him without placing it before the Municipal Council for reconsideration, a recommendation was made to Government under Section 24(1)(b) of the City Municipalities Act, 1933, to veto the resolution of the Municipal Council in the matter

3) It is needless to say that some of the members of the Council were interested to see that the grant was rushed through as they commanded majority in the Council I came to know from confidential enquiries that some one wanted to take over the site from the grante paying him a little more money, as the grantee could not build upon the site In my view of the case the action of the Vice President even to place the subject before the Council for reconsideration was not considered compatible with his responsibility to guard the interest of the Municipal finances

p t o

4) I may also mention here that the site in question is situated in the Kumar Park Area which belongs to Government The value of sites sold in this area has to be credited, I believe, to Government after deducting the cost of making roads, etc That being so, I doubt if the Municipal Council can dispose of the valuable site in an ostensible mood of charity

5) The disposal of a highly valuable site by the Municipal Council in exchange for a plot of small value, in the circumstances already reported constitutes abuse of power by the Council and seems to be a fit case for enquiry and action under Section 226 (i) of the Municipal Act

6) Again, in case the Government are satisfied that the action of the Municipal Council in proposing to dispose of the site for a nominal sum is not justifiable, they can withhold approval to the Resolution under 41(2) of the Municipal Act

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE

L 2277 12/6/43

To the Chief Commr, Bangalore ~~the Pol~~

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No L10818 dt 7-5-43 in the matter of the grant of a site No 147, Subedar Chatram Road, Bangr, to Mr Bandappa, I am directed to forward herewith a copy of letter No C-B 90/42-43 dt 1-6-43 received from the Dy Commr (Mr H A Khan) Officer on the subject & to request you to be so good as to state definitely whether the site in question belongs to the Chief or to the Govt (vide paras 2 of the letter) An immediate reply is requested. I have etc

for

Dy Secy to Govt
Law Dept

14/6

KSM

V K Jayaraman
Hon Pr

BANGALORE CITY MUNICIPALITY

No L1-197/38 MUNICIPAL OFFICES

Encl One sketch 92-42-92 Bangalore 5th Nov, 1943

FROM

SEOY L/PY DEPT 11 NOV 1943 GOVT OF MYSORE

SURYANARAYANA SETTI ESQ BA LL B
MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONER
Bangalore City

GEN & PRV SECRT 2888/L 11 NOV 1943 L S E N DEPT

C Narayanaswamy Naidu, Esq, B A, B L,

SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE
LAW DEPARTMENT BANGALORE

SIR

With reference to your letter No L 12277/M1 dated 17-6-1943 in the matter of the grant of site No 147, Subedar Chatram Road, Bangalore City to Mr Yajaman Bandappa I have the honour to state that a portion of the site marked in blue in the enclosed sketch, measuring 295 sq yards belongs to Kumara Park area and the remaining portion of the site belongs to the Municipality

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

T Surayanarayana Setti
Municipal Commissioner

orwarded with compliments

As seen from the plan the portion marked blue is a very small plot, not suitable for an independent site. Considering the value of the land taken from the applicant the rate now proposed to be given is very little. Since the lay out in this area was taken up by the Government, this mistake has happened. Hence the Government may kindly be moved to approve the action of the municipality for this bit of land

V K Gundappa
Hon Pr

ksm

Appendix F G —1]

SUBJECT

Diary No of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 194

Date of issue 21/1

Signed by

List of enclosures

Coded by

Examined by

Section ML

File No 92-42

Serial No 93

No L7458/Rems

To The ML Commr. Bly. thro the Dept

Sir,

With reference to the Correspondence ending with your letter No L1-197/38 dt 5-11-1943 in the matter of the Grant of a site No 147, Subedar Chatram Road, Bangalore to Mr Yegnam Bandappa, and the exchange of the land said to belong to him in the Krumbarguda Road. Taken over by the City Mcpl, for the purpose of laying out a road, on condition of his paying at the rate of Rs 4 per sq yard of the land which is in excess etc, of the area actually due to

am directed to state
that the Govt are not in
favour of ~~the proposal to~~ granting 2 95 sq yds
~~the portion of the~~ of land situated in the Kumeroo Park Area &
belonging
to them, as recommended by the Mel
that the Mel
may give Compensation in
money for the lands acquired from Mr Randolph
in the usual course

The Records accompany

J Hanek
for
Sec to Govt
Law Deptt

11/9
19/1